



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

teaching and the average public morality. We are not satisfied with this statement, nor are we prepared to believe that the Koran has lost with its devotees all influence or weight. M. Mathieu reiterates his assertion, and has no misgiving concerning it.

Another statement which he makes concerning the difference between the Sunnites and the Shiites in regard to the Koran as a created existence, the former maintaining that it began to be, while the latter asserts its eternity, is open to some question. Equally curious is his discrimination between the Greek and Latin Purgatories; the Latin Purgatory being a place of bodily suffering, while in the Greek, souls are purified by the expectation of bliss. The Greek Purgatory is a very pleasant place for the wicked.

All travellers in the East must have remarked the universal custom of carrying strings of beads, and twirling them in conversation. It is not easy to learn the reason for this custom from the men who practise it. But M. Mathieu insists that it is for the purpose of bringing the hands in front of the body. In a different posture, hostility is implied. A man who meets you with hands behind his back, must be regarded as your enemy. He is not the first to mention the resemblance of the Gypsy dialect to the Sanscrit, or the fact that Orientals worship the dove. Some may think him too harsh in stigmatizing all Turkish justice as venal, and representing bribery as the universal custom in the courts; but he has not much overstated the fact. The custom of compelling the winner, rather than the loser, to pay the costs of court, has no doubt a salutary effect in checking litigation. But it would require more space than we have to do justice to these very valuable and instructive volumes. The closing chapter on Turkish reforms, which M. Mathieu considers entirely chimerical, and the Appendix, which contains a careful description of the walls, the mosques, and the various Christian and mediæval remains of Constantinople, exhibit well the characteristics of the author's thought and style.

-
3. *Shakspeare. Jules César, Tragedie traduite en Vers Français. Avec le Texte Anglais au Bas des Pages. Précédée d'une Étude et suivie de Notes.* Par C. CARLHAUT. Paris: Didot. 1856. 8vo. pp. 248.

ALL attempts to naturalize in France the dramas of Shakespeare seem destined to fail. The Germans boast that Schlegel's translations enable them to understand these great works better than the English themselves; and with reason they claim that Hamlet and

Macbeth are more adequately represented in the *Burg-theater* of Vienna than on any stage in the English metropolis. But in France the case is different. Neither French taste nor the French language can conform itself to the stately measure of Shakespeare's tragedies. Voltaire attempted, indeed, to introduce "Julius Cæsar" to his countrymen; yet his version is of only half the original, and is so varied from the text of Shakespeare that it is substantially a new work. M. Carlhaut could hardly expect to succeed where Voltaire had failed, and his preliminary note seems to tell us that he is quite aware of the extreme boldness of his attempt. He ventures, however. His work is divided into two parts. The first part, which occupies eighty pages, is a critical examination of the drama, in its subject and its form. It vindicates triumphantly the genius of Shakespeare from the assaults of French poets and playwrights, and exhibits with considerable skill the masterly use which the great dramatist has here made of his abundant material. M. Carlhaut's analysis will not compare, certainly, with that of the German or English critics of Shakespeare. It is not exhaustive, nor does it give us any new insight into the beauties or subtleties of the play. But it shows a candid and patient study, the result of which has become sympathy and enthusiasm. It shows also a brave forgetfulness of those tyrannous rules by which the old French Academy hampered all study of foreign works of art. M. Carlhaut has as much reverence for Corneille and Racine as any frequenter of the "Théâtre Français" ought to have; but he will not judge the English romantic drama by the laws of that classic playhouse.

At the outset of his translation (which makes the second part of the volume) a serious difficulty presented itself. Portions of the original—the jesting of the rabble with the tribunes, the report of Casca to Cassius and Brutus, and the speech of Brutus himself to the people—are in plain prose. Should they be rendered into equivalent prose, or preserve, according to French taste, the heroic rhythm of the rest of the drama? M. Carlhaut has chosen the latter method, and has made these speeches rhyme as accurately as the periods of Antony's funeral oration. The necessity of rhyme, too, was another obstacle in the way of a faithful translation; and this makes some fine turns of the original feeble and ludicrous in the version. In the very first line, the need of finding a rhyme for "artisan," led to the rendering of "get you home" by "allez vous-en," which is certainly a poor dilution of the original. And sometimes this necessity compels an entire change of the English expression. For instance, in the interview of Brutus with Ligarius in Act II. Scene I., where Brutus says,

"A piece of work that will make sick men whole,"

and Ligarius answers,

“ But are not some whole that we must make sick ? ”

the translation has it :—

“ *Brutus.* Un effort

Qui rende à tous la vie.”

“ *Ligarius.* Et va donner la mort

Sans doute à quelques uns ? ”

Thus turning the poetic thought of Shakespeare to the blankest prose. We might multiply instances of this kind from every page of the translation. The excuse for such variations is, that the form of French tragic verse renders them inevitable. For the convenience of his readers, the author has placed at the foot of his page the English original. He thus furnishes to his English readers an opportunity to see how imperfect his renderings are.

The best thing that we can say of this translation of Julius Cæsar is, that it is faithful to the plot and the order of Shakespeare's play, and free from very gross blunders. M. Carlhaut has studied his theme carefully enough to apprehend its drift, but by no means sufficiently to discern the niceties of meaning in each choice word and epithet. He has translated the story, but not the poem. In his version it becomes nothing more than rhymed prose. Even the speech of Antony, in the French hexameters, is merely a jingling narrative, without any of that rhetorical pathos, fire, and cunning insinuation which make the original such a consummate piece of pleading.

The notes, which are few, are yet numerous enough to contain several errors. The mechanical execution of the volume is very superior,—in the best style of Didot. It is quite rare to find an English piece printed in Paris with so few typographical errors.

4. — *Le Roman de la Momie.* Par THEOPHILE GAUTIER. Paris : Hachette. 1858. Petit 8vo. pp. 302.

WHO but a Frenchman would think of making a mummy the subject of a love-story ? M. Gautier is an experienced artist in the manipulation of romantic fancies, and he has managed to extract from the unrolling of his mummy something better worth preserving than the mass of rags and bitumen which is the usual residuum of such efforts. Not the least entertaining chapter in the book is the prologue, in which the author tells how he came into possession of the precious history. In this prologue, he hits with pleasant satire the peculiarities of the Eng-